



Bay Area Dioxins Project



Association of Bay Area
Governments

Summary of Discussions TASK FORCE CONFERENCE CALL April 7, 2003

Attending the meeting were:

Nabil Al-Hadithy, City of Berkeley*

Robin Breuer, City/County of San Francisco*

JoAnna Bullock, ABAG Staff

Betsy Elzufon, LWA+

Pamela Evans, Alameda County*

John Katz, US EPA

Jennifer Krebs, ABAG Staff

Kelly Moran, TDC Environmental+

Michael Smith, ABAG Staff

Julie Weiss, City of Palo Alto*

(+ Task Force consultant, * Task Force member)

Welcome/Introductions

Jennifer Krebs convened the meeting and welcomed Task Force members. The purpose of the meeting was to review the draft needs assessment provided by LWA and TDC, the task force consultants. The needs assessment is the first deliverable for EPA from this year's PBT Challenge Grant.

Participants quickly said the report was accurate and thorough and turned to discuss which tasks had highest priority in the upcoming year.

Needs Assessment

The group quickly agreed to number the tasks to facilitate discussion during the call (a copy of the report, with the new numbering, is attached). Jennifer Krebs did suggest adding the website updating to the list at a cost of \$3000 per year. She also noted the cost for Task 9, quarterly meetings, to be \$5000 per year. Agreement was quickly reached that items 8, 9, and 10 were essential to the Task Force's work.

All the other tasks were discussed – most of them were seen as desirable. Some of them seemed more realistic given the budget and agencies participating than others.

Alameda County will continue with its efforts to expand the existing purchases of PCF paper to include other departments and programs (Task 1). The group agreed that if possible, technical consulting should be offered to Alameda County under continued grant funding. Members were less sure about Tasks 2 and 3 at this particular time.

It was suggested that Task 2 be modified to concentrate on unbleached bathroom papers (paper towels, toilet paper, etc.) rather than PCF paper because of the budget difficulties that cities and counties currently face. Jurisdictions with tight budgets would most likely not consider

switching to PCF paper because it does cost more. Unbleached bathroom papers, however, tend to either cost the same, or slightly less, than bleached papers. It was later suggested that Tasks 2 and 4 be combined.

It was suggested that Task 4 include materials that provide examples of what municipalities have done in an effort to reduce the production of dioxins. This way, communities that have not started a dioxins pollution prevention process could learn a lot from the lessons learned by municipalities that have already started, or completed, their own process. Some of the materials suggested were good examples of language for resolutions, identifying who sets purchasing policies for local governments, and examples of other lessons learned by jurisdictions that have gone through, or are currently going through, the process of instituting policies to reduce the production of dioxins. There was some discussion of reducing the number of pollution prevention options that would be researched as a way to save money on this task.

Members suggested that Tasks 5 and 6 could be combined to save money. Task 6 would be the first half of the daylong conference and Task 5 would be the second half. It was also suggested that maybe the Task Force was not ready for a conference this year.

Prior to the discussion of Task 7, it was stated that the Medical Waste Project was running low on money. Given the project tasks, the only flexible aspect of the project would be time spent assisting cities. Also, the consultants would like to hear back from the California Department of Health Services before finalizing the report. The proposed budget for Task 7 ranged from \$5,000-\$10,000. Members of the Task Force decided to cap the budget for Task 7 at \$5,000.

Discussion of the final accomplishments report (Task 8), required by the EPA PBT grant, included the possibility of combining Task 4 with the final report.

The Needs Assessment report states that there are potential sources of grant funding to augment the Task Force's budget. The members briefly discussed the option and authorized Jennifer to seek grant funding for the project.

A group of Task Force members and staff agreed to a follow-up conference call on May 8th to finalize the proposed budget and tasks based on the discussions of the April 7th conference call. The final budget and work program will be presented to the Task Force for their approval at the June meeting.

Adjournment

Next meeting:

- June 24, 2003, 1:00pm, ABAG Office, Conference Room B